



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

THE ECLIPSE GROUP  
10453 RAINTREE LANE  
NORTHRIDGE, CA 91326

**COPY MAILED**

**JUN 16 2005**

**OFFICE OF PETITIONS**

**ON PETITION**

In re Application of :  
Steven A. Gronemeyer :  
Application No. 10/600,174 :  
Filed: June 20, 2003 :  
Attorney Docket No. ST04004CIP :

This is a decision on the petition under 37 CFR 1.137(a), filed February 2, 2005, to revive the above-identified application.

The petition is **dismissed**.

Any request for reconsideration of this decision must be submitted within TWO (2) MONTHS from the mail date of this decision. Extensions of time under 37 CFR 1.136(a) are permitted. The reconsideration request should include a cover letter entitled "Renewed Petition under 37 CFR 1.137(a)."

This application became abandoned for failure to timely pay the issue fee and publication fee, if applicable, and submit corrected drawings, on or before October 26, 2004. Accordingly, this application became abandoned on October 27, 2004. A Notice of Abandonment was mailed on December 2, 2004.

A grantable petition to revive an abandoned application under 37 CFR 1.137(a) must be accompanied by:

- (1) The required reply, unless previously filed. In a nonprovisional application abandoned for failure to prosecute, the required reply may be met by the filing of a continuing application. In an application or patent, abandoned or lapsed for failure to pay the issue fee or any portion thereof, the required reply must be the payment of the issue fee or any outstanding balance thereof;
- (2) The petition fee as set forth in § 1.17(l);
- (3) A showing to the satisfaction of the Commissioner that the entire delay in filing the required reply from the due date for the reply until the filing of a grantable petition pursuant to this paragraph was unavoidable; and

- (4) Any terminal disclaimer (and fee as set forth in § 1.20 (d)) required pursuant to paragraph (c) of this section.

This petition lacks items (1) and (3), above.

Decisions on reviving abandoned applications on the basis of “unavoidable” delay have adopted the reasonably prudent person standard in determining if the delay was unavoidable:

The word ‘unavoidable’ . . . is applicable to ordinary human affairs, and requires no more or greater care or diligence than is generally used and observed by prudent and careful men in relation to their most important business. It permits them in the exercise of this care to rely upon the ordinary and trustworthy agencies of mail and telegraph, worthy and reliable employees, and such other means and instrumentalities as are usually employed in such important business. If unexpectedly, or through the unforeseen fault or imperfection of these agencies and instrumentalities, there occurs a failure, it may properly be said to be unavoidable, all other conditions of promptness in its rectification being present.

In re Mattullath, 38 App. D.C. 497, 514-15 (1912)(quoting Ex parte Pratt, 1887 Dec. Comm’r Pat. 31, 32-33 (1887)); see also Winkler v. Ladd, 221 F. Supp. 550, 552, 138 USPQ 666, 167-68 (D.D.C. 1963), aff’d, 143 USPQ 172 (D.C. Cir. 1963); Ex parte Henrich, 1913 Dec. Comm’r Pat. 139, 141 (1913). In addition, decisions on revival are made on a “case-by-case basis, taking all the facts and circumstances into account.” Smith v. Mossinghoff, 671 F.2d 533, 538, 213 USPQ 977, 982 (D.C. Cir. 1982). Finally, a petition cannot be granted where a petitioner has failed to meet his or her burden of establishing that the delay was “unavoidable.” Haines v. Quigg, 673 F. Supp. 314, 316-17, 5 USPQ2d 1130, 1131-32 (N.D. Ind. 1987).

Regarding Item (1):

A Notice of Allowability was mailed in the instant application on July 26, 2004, simultaneously with the Notice of Allowance and Issue Fee Due. The Notice of Allowability set forth a reply period of three months from the mailing date of July 26, 2004 in which petitioner was required to submit new corrected drawings. The three-month period was not extendable. Thus, the Notice of Allowability and the Notice of Allowance and Issue Fee Due set forth concurrent but distinct requirements with which petitioner was required to comply. Accordingly, pursuant to the provision of 37 CFR 1.137(a)(1) and in accordance with 35 USC 133 and 151, the submission of corrected drawings is a necessary component of the required reply. Since petitioner has failed to submit corrected drawings, the petition must be dismissed.

Regarding Item (2):

The record indicates that Shemwell Gregory & Courtney, LLP was responsible for prosecution of the above-identified application when the reply necessary to avoid abandonment was due. Therefore, petitioner must provide a statement from Shemwell Gregory & Courtney, LLP explaining why action was not timely taken to prevent the above-identified application from becoming abandoned.

Furthermore, please note, a delay caused by the failure on the part of petitioner, or petitioner's representative, to provide the Patent and Trademark Office with a current correspondence address does not constitute an unavoidable delay. See Ray v. Lehman, 55 F.3d 606, 34 USPQ2d 1786 (Fed. Cir. 1995).

Petitioner may wish to consider filing a renewed petition under amended 37 C.F.R. § 1.137(b). 37 C.F.R. § 1.137(b) now provides that where the delay in reply was unintentional, a petition may be filed to revive an abandoned application or a lapsed patent pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.137(b). A grantable petition pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.137(b) must be accompanied by:

- (1) The required reply, unless previously filed. In a nonprovisional application abandoned for failure to prosecute, the required reply may be met by the filing of a continuing application. In an application or patent, abandoned or lapsed for failure to pay the issue fee or any portion thereof, the required reply must be the payment of the issue fee or any outstanding balance thereof;
- (2) The petition fee as set forth in § 1.17(m),
- (3) A **statement** that the entire delay in filing the required reply from the due date for the reply until the filing of a grantable petition pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.137(b) was unintentional. The Commissioner may require additional information where there is a question whether the delay was unintentional; and
- (4) Any terminal disclaimer (and fee as set forth in § 1.20(d)) required pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.137(c).

By mail:                      Mail Stop Petition  
   Commissioner for Patents  
   Box 1450  
   Alexandria, VA 22313

By FAX: (703) 872-9306  
Attn: Office of Petitions

By hand: Customer Service Window  
Randolph Building  
401 Dulany Street  
Alexandria, VA 22314

Telephone inquiries should be directed to the undersigned at (571) 272-3228.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Ed T', followed by a long horizontal line.

Edward J. Tannouse  
Petitions Attorney  
Office of Petitions/Patent  
United States Patent and Trademark Office